



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/868,505	06/18/2001	Yoshiya Sakaguchi	43890-522	1376

20277 7590 02/23/2005

MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP
600 13TH STREET, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005-3096

EXAMINER

GOFF II, JOHN L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1733

DATE MAILED: 02/23/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No. 09/868,505	Applicant(s) SAKAGUCHI ET AL.	
	Examiner John L. Goff	Art Unit 1733	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 18 January 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS

Art Unit: 1733

Continuation of 3. NOTE:

Regarding the amendments to claims 1, 25, and 32, as discussed in the interview the new limitations appear to overcome the prior art of record. However, as the limitations were not previously considered the amendments raise new issues that require further search and/or consideration.

Regarding applicants arguments to claim 27, Hass et al. teach forming a multilayer stack including a steel plate on the upper surface of the stack to control distribution of the stresses during pressing and ensure the upper surface of the stack possesses an adequate surface finish and flatness. Furthermore, Hass et al. teach pressing multiple multilayer stacks. Thus, Hass et al. at a minimum suggest an arrangement as follows: a **“first” resilient body** -> steel plate -> **first multilayer stack** -> resilient body -> a **steel plate** -> **second multilayer stack** -> a **“second” resilient body** -> etc. The claim requires a first multilayer stack sandwiched between a first resilient body and a steel plate and a second multilayer stack sandwiched between a second resilient body and the same steel plate. This limitation is met by Hass et al.

Regarding applicants arguments to claim 38, this argument is addressed in the previous Office Action through the rejection of claim 38.

Regarding new claims 39-42, the new claims are added without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. The new claims may present new matter. The new claims present new issues that would require further search and/or consideration.



John L. Goff